UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/393,677	02/24/95	KIRA H	950107

D1M1/0618

ARMSTRONG WESTERMAN HATTORI
MC LELAND AND NAUGHTON
1725 K STREET NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON DC 20006

EXAMINER	
GRAYBILL, D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1107	

DATE MAILED: 06/18/97

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)
08/393,677	Kira et al.
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
David E. Graybill	1107

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

a) ☒ expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on _____ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on *30 May 1997* **has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:**

☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).

☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).

☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: *The entire amendment raises new issues that would require further undue consideration and/or search.*

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached office action.

☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: *none*

Claims objected to: *none*

Claims rejected: *1-8*

☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ .

☐ Other

DAVID E. GRAYBILL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1107

Applicant's remarks filed 5-30-97 have been fully considered and are addressed infra.

Applicant argues that, "it is not necessary in the applicants' claimed invention to precisely adjust viscosity of the adhesive." This argument is respectfully deemed to be unpersuasive because the prior art is not relied on for this teaching. Moreover, the instant claims are not limited to a process comprising wherein it is not necessary to precisely adjust viscosity of the adhesive.

Also, applicant contends that in the process of Fujimoto, "there would be insufficient liquidity for the adhesive to pass through very short intervals between the large number of chips or terminals. This contention is respectfully deemed to be unpersuasive because Fujimoto is not relied on in the rejection for this teaching. Furthermore, it has been held that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of one reference may be bodily incorporated into another to produce the claimed subject matter but simply what the combination of references makes obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. In re Van Beckum 169 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1971); In re Bozek 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969); In re Sneed 218 USPQ 385 (CCPA 1983).

Finally, applicant alleges, "no such two types of fixing are taught in Maeda." Again, this allegation is respectfully deemed to be unpersuasive because Maeda is not relied on in the rejection for this teaching.

The remaining arguments are moot because they are directed to the unentered amendment.

Any telephone inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status (MPEP 203.08) of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist at (703) 308-0661.

Any telephone inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Graybill at (703) 308-2947. Regular office hours: Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, supervisory primary examiner, John Niebling, can be reached at (703) 308-3325.

The fax phone number for group 1100 is (703) 305-3599.

David E. Graybill
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1107

D.G.